

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P. Dox 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,291	06/30/2003	Lawrence A. Booth JR.	884.897US1	5782
21186	7590 04/29/2005		EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938			TUNG, KEE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	
			DATE MAILED: 04/29/2009	ς .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/612,291	BOOTH ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kee M Tung	2676			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine de patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 F	ebruary 2005.				
2a)□						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 1-14 and 21-28 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 15 and 17 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 16 and 18-20 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Applicat	ion Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Infori	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate atent Application (PTO-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The response and Affidavits filed 2/14/05 has been considered in preparing this Office action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Littlefield (4,949,280).

Littlefield teaches a communication device (Fig. 5) comprising an application processor (29; col. 7, lines 20-33 teaches any number of APs can be used) having a first interface (not shown, but would have been obvious to include because the interface provides basic connection between two devices for communications, such as, the output port of AP 29); a coprocessor (10) having a second interface (also not shown, but would have been obvious to include because the interface provides basic connection between two devices for communications, such as the input port of 10) to receive formatted command data and formatted output data from the application processor, the coprocessor also having an output interface (also not shown, but would have been obvious to include because the interface provides basic connection between two devices for communications, such as the output port of 10) to provide output data to an I/O device (16); and a high-speed datapath (18) to communicate the formatted

Application/Control Number: 10/612,291 Page 3

Art Unit: 2676

command data and formatted output data between the first interface and the second interface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to implement the teachings of Littlefield as claimed in order to provide the high-speed communications between application processor and a graphics processor and thus to increase the system performance. Therefore, at least claim 15 would have been obvious.

As per claim 17, Littlefield teaches the coprocessor further comprises a coprocessor processing core (12) responsive to the command data and output data to generate the output data for I/O device.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 1-14 and 21-28 are allowed.
- 4. Claims 16 and 18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kee M Tung whose telephone number is 571-272-7794. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 5:30 am - 4:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/612,291 Page 4

Art Unit: 2676

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kee M Tung
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2676